



**DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION
PESTICIDE REGISTRATION AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes – January 19, 2007 (amended)**

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Patti L. TenBrook, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Reg. 9 (U.S. EPA)
Dave Whitmer, California Agriculture Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA)
Lynn Baker, Air Resources Board (ARB)
Martha Harnly, Department of Health Services (DHS-EHIB)
Barry Wilson, University of California Department of Environmental Toxicology (UCD)
Syed Ali, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Bob Schlag, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Barbara Todd, Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
Tobi Jones, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)

Visitors in Attendance:

Nasser Dean, Western Plant Health Association
Denise Webster, DPR
John Sanders, DPR
Eileen Mahoney, DPR
Pam Wofford, DPR
Joe Karkoski, Central Valley RWQCB
Margie Lopez Read, CVRWQCB
Chuck Andrews, DPR
Tom Jacob, DuPont
Greg Gorder, Technical Sciences Group (TSG)
Roberta Firoved, CA Rice Commission
Angela Csondes, ARB
Linda O'Connell, DPR
Glenn Brank, DPR
Nan Singhasemanon, DPR
Brian Bret, Dow Agro Sciences
John Pearson, Compliance Services
Jeffrey Smith, Valent
Leslie Garcia, Valent
Stan Van Vleck, DVD
Darren Van Steenwick, Clark Pest Control
Greg Hyatt, Inside CAL/EPA
Scott Kohne, Bayer
Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Patricia Gouveia, SWRCB
Jerry Knobs, T.K.I.
Bill Thomas
Doug Okumura, Lawson & Associates
Liang Chen, EHIB
Xiuodong Sun, EHIB



1. Introductions and Committee Business - Tobi Jones, Chairperson

- a. About 40 people attended the meeting.
- b. There were no corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting held on November 17, 2006.

2. DPR'S Air Quality Initiative: Fumigant Emission Reduction Regulations- Paul Gosselin, Chief Deputy Director, DPR.

The Department of Pesticide Regulation will take two critical actions in 2007. First, regulations will be put in place to meet existing commitments by December 31, 2007. Secondly, by June a new commitment will be developed for future reductions. For the current commitments, DPR will meet its obligations under the 1994 State Implementation Plan (SIP) and a 2006 Federal court order to reduce VOC emissions from pesticides in five non attainment areas. These obligations will be achieved through fumigation regulations. The fumigant emission regulations will limit application methods to low emission methods. For example, data shows variations in emissions based on application methods. A paper detailing the approach will be released for external peer review and public comment. The fumigant emission regulations will address all fumigants and cover three distinct sections: 1) VOC emission reductions; 2) MITC mitigation measures; 3) Regulatory consistency. The schedule for completing the regulations are:

- March 2007: Completion of draft regulation package.
- March 2007 – November 2007: Notice, comment, and review process.
- November 2007: Submission to State Office of Administrative Law (OAL) for approval.
- December 2007: OAL approval.
- January 2008: Implementation of regulations.

3. Overview of the Pesticide Component of the State Implementation Plan – Paul Gosselin, Chief Deputy Director, DPR

DPR is developing a new commitment that will improve upon and replace 1994 State Implementation Plan. The new commitment will be based on enforceable provisions focusing on fumigant emission reductions and VOC content reductions in emulsifiable concentrates. Additionally strategic partnerships to foster pest management and technology innovations will be developed. The schedule for completing the new commitment is:

- Draft for public comment in mid-March through the Air Resources Board.
- Approved by the Air Resources Board and submitted to U.S. EPA by June 2007.

4. Consideration of a Water Analytical Method for New Active Ingredients-

Margie Lopez-Read, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Patricia Gouveia, State Water Resources Control Board.

Patricia Gouveia introduced the topic by identifying the lack of pesticide analytical methods for water as a challenge to water quality agencies and that this has been a problem for more than a decade. Many currently used pesticides can't be monitored at environmentally relevant concentrations that are practical for production analytical laboratories. Only a fraction of pesticides have suitable analytical methods.

Margie Lopez-Read discussed the issue as it relates to the Central Valley Board's Irrigated Lands Program. Margie had discussed this program previously with the committee and provided interim results of monitoring. She described the analytical scans that are available for suites of pesticides, but identified that these analytical tools do not cover all pesticides that are used in agriculture. She discussed the steps that coalitions, formed under the Irrigated Lands Programs, take to monitor toxicity and conduct chemical analysis of water leaving irrigated lands. She indicated that better availability of pesticide analytical methods could potentially reduce the cost to farmers participating in the program because they may be able to bypass the more expensive toxicity tests by focusing on analysis for applied pesticides. Currently some coalition members pay laboratories to develop methods. Ms. Lopez-Read is seeking assistance to address this analytical need.

Ms. Gouveia identified that the need for analytical methods also applies to urban water quality regulators. She used the experience of the San Francisco Regional Water Board as an example when this board was addressing diazinon and chlorpyrifos in urban creeks, and more recently, pyrethroid pesticides. Both representatives expressed an interest in working with DPR to develop a list of priorities for methods to begin to address the issue.

There was committee discussion with the presenters of the need for more sensitive analytical methods. The Chairperson identified that many available analytical methods are for commodity residue analysis, and that more sensitive water methods are not currently a requirement. Some other more sensitive methods are embedded in data submitted to DPR. There was discussion of California requiring registrants to provide analytical methods capable of measuring environmentally sensitive concentrations as a prerequisite for registration. There was discussion of whether the U.S. EPA is addressing this issue as the Office of Pesticide Programs works more closely with the Office of Water to address surface water quality issues. There was a question of whether there should be an aide from the Legislature as a member of the committee, and discussion of whether that was appropriate with the intent of the committee itself. There was discussion about farmers using pesticide label directions and assuming that those directions prevent surface water contamination in the first place.

Action Item: DPR to initiate discussions with representatives of the state and regional water boards to address the need for water analytical methods.

5. Interim Monitoring Results from Parlier Air Monitoring Study - Pam Wofford,
Environmental Monitoring Branch

As part of the California Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Justice Action Plan, the DPR is conducting a pilot project focusing on pesticide air concentrations in Parlier. The objective of the study is:

- To determine if the residents of Parlier are being exposed to pesticides, and if so, which pesticides and in what amounts.
- If the measured levels exceed levels of concern to human health, particularly children.
- Tell the community about the project.
- Evaluate pesticide risk compared with other pollutants that are monitored.
- Reduce pesticide risk.
- Follow up on the findings. For example, DPR might provide education and technical support to farmers to encourage them to use alternatives that are less toxic or, if there are health concerns, DPR can put stricter controls on certain problematic uses.

The results presented include preliminary monitoring results from January 1 to August 16, 2006. DPR, with assistance from other agencies (the California Air Resources Board and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District), is monitoring for pesticides as well as other pollutants. Most pesticide monitoring occurs three consecutive days each week at three elementary schools in Parlier: Martinez (northwest part of town), Benavidez (central), and Chavez (southeast).

For January through August, the key findings were:

- Twenty-two pesticides or breakdown products were detected.
- Two pesticides exceeded the acute health screening levels. Diazinon exceeded the acute screening level during one day of the 297 days monitored. The highest concentration detected for the pesticide diazinon was 172 ng/m³ and the diazinon oxygen analog (OA) detected in the same sample was 71 ng/m³. The acute screening level for diazinon and diazinon OA is 130 ng/m³ for each chemical. In addition, acrolein exceeded the acute health screening levels for most of the days monitored. There was no reported use of

acrolein in the Parlier area and detections were likely due to non-pesticidal sources (for example, vehicle emissions).

- The pesticide with the highest concentration was formaldehyde, detected at 9,250 ng/m³ (below the acute screening level of 19,000 ng/m³). The formaldehyde detections were likely due to non-pesticidal sources.
- The chemical with the highest concentration that likely resulted from pesticide use was the fumigant MITC, detected at 5,010 ng/m³ (acute screening level is 66,000 ng/m³). MITC was also the pesticide most frequently (78 percent of 297 samples) detected by DPR. All were well below the screening level.
- As many as 11 pesticides were detected at an individual location and day (four additional pesticides were likely due to non-pesticidal sources), and 82 percent of the locations and days monitored had detectable concentrations of more than one pesticide.

6. Agenda Items for Next Meeting- Tobi Jones, DPR

The next meeting will be held on Friday, March 16, 2007, in the Sierra Hearing Room on the second floor of the Cal/EPA building, located at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California.

7. Closing Comments - Tobi Jones

The meeting was adjourned.